

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In view of the foregoing, claims 1, 7, 9, 12 and 15 have been amended. Claims 17-23 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, 12, 15 and 16 are pending and under consideration.

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW

The Applicants extend their thanks to the Examiner for the courtesy shown to their representative during the Interview held on October 9, 2008. In the Interview, the Examiner noted that she was maintaining her position regarding most of the grounds of rejection in the Office Action. However, the Examiner noted that the relied on references may not adequately show a single magnetic member, while noting that in her opinion a single magnet was shown.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 15 and 17-23 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasato et al. (US 6,181,670) (hereinafter "Nagasato" in view of Van Rosmalen et al. (US 6,130,418) (hereinafter "Van Rosmalen").

Claims 4, 8, 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasato in view of Van Rosmalen and further in view of Choi (US 2003/0198148) (hereinafter "Choi").

#### **Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8**

Amended claim 1 recites: "...a single magnetic member installed on the blade between the focusing coil member and the tracking coil member..." Support for this amendment may be found in at least Figures 2-4 of the present application.

As noted in the Office Action, the Examiner notes that Nagasato does not discuss that a single magnetic member is installed on the blade between the focusing coil member and the tracking coil member that are both installed on the base of the optical pickup actuator. Instead, the Examiner relies on Van Rosmalen to show this feature of claim 1. Van Rosmalen discusses an optical pickup actuator includes a permanent magnet 45 and ferromagnetic members. As amended, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 clearly recites a single **magnetic** member, and therefore patentably distinguishes over Van Rosmalen.

This technical feature of claim 1 provides that since the number of magnet members is reduced from two to one, and a portion of the blade required in the conventional focusing coil member, due to the asymmetric structure of the optical pickup actuator, can be removed, the length of the blade can be reduced, thereby overcoming the weakness of conventional systems having a reduced second resonance frequency when the resultant size of the optical pickup actuator is reduced.

Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

**Claims 9, 11, 12, 15 and 16**

Amended claim 9 recites: "...a single magnetic member installed on the blade between the focusing coil member and the tracking coil member..." Support for this amendment may be found in at least Figures 2-4 of the present application.

As noted in the Office Action, the Examiner notes that Nagasato does not discuss that a single magnetic member is installed on the blade between the focusing coil member and the tracking coil member that are both installed on the base of the optical pickup actuator. Instead, the Examiner relies on Van Rosmalen to show this feature of claim 9. Van Rosmalen discusses an optical pickup actuator includes a permanent magnet 45 and ferromagnetic members. As amended, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 clearly recites a single **magnetic** member, and therefore patentably distinguishes over Van Rosmalen.

Claims 11, 12, 15 and 16 depend on claim 9 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

**Claims 17-23**

Claims 17-23 have been cancelled.

**CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct 21, 2008

By: Gregory W. Harper  
Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501